

## **I. OVERVIEW AND OBJECTIVES**

The Food Stamp Program (FSP) is the cornerstone of the federal government's strategy for ensuring that all Americans have enough to eat. The program provides low-income individuals and families with benefits that can be redeemed for food at authorized stores. However, not all those eligible for benefits participate in the program, especially elderly persons. About one-third of elderly individuals estimated to be eligible participate, compared with more than two-thirds of nonelderly eligible individuals (Rosso 2001). The low rates of participation among the elderly might indicate that the FSP is not fulfilling its mission to provide food assistance to all those who need it.

To address the low participation rates among the elderly, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is funding the Elderly Nutrition Demonstrations—five or six separate pilot programs that are testing alternative ways to serve the elderly.<sup>1</sup> These demonstrations reflect three distinct strategies and are intended to increase elderly participation in the FSP and improve the satisfaction of elderly persons who participate. Insights and information obtained from the evaluation of these demonstrations should help federal policymakers formulate effective strategies for increasing FSP participation among the elderly.

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., (MPR) was selected through a competitive bidding process to design the evaluation of the Elderly Nutrition Demonstration pilots. This report details the steps necessary to evaluate the impact of each demonstration on elderly FSP participation, benefits, administrative costs, and client satisfaction. It also describes the process

---

<sup>1</sup>Currently there are five pilots; a sixth state may receive demonstration funding before the evaluation begins.

analysis that will be used to study the implementation of these demonstrations and the effects on stakeholders.

#### **A. THE PROBLEM OF LOW FSP PARTICIPATION RATES BY THE ELDERLY**

Reaching the poor elderly has been a persistent problem in the FSP. Each month, millions of eligible, poor elderly individuals go without food stamp benefits. In September 1999, 5.3 million elderly individuals were estimated to be eligible for food stamps (Castner 2000). Only 32 percent of them participated in the FSP, leaving 3.6 million eligible elderly individuals without benefits.

Historically, no more than one-third of eligible elderly individuals have participated in the FSP—a participation rate that is far lower than that of any other major demographic group. In 1999, the participation rate for all nonelderly, FSP-eligible individuals was almost twice that of the elderly. Five years earlier, when economic conditions were not as strong, the participation rate for the nonelderly was much higher, at 78 percent, yet the participation rate for the elderly was still just 32 percent.

Low participation rates for the elderly are especially troublesome because these individuals have unique nutritional needs. Many elderly persons suffer from medical or dental conditions that require special diets. For instance, diabetes and heart disease are common among the elderly, and many elderly individuals are overweight. It is estimated that more than two-thirds of the elderly have multiple medical conditions (Hoffman and Rice 1995). Low-income elderly persons are especially disadvantaged for two reasons. First, rates of chronic health conditions are significantly higher in the low-income population (U.S. DHHS 2000). Second, low-income elderly individuals with health conditions often face choosing between spending resources on food and spending them on medication—a choice that can harm their health whatever they

decide. Thus, without food assistance, the nutritional needs of the low-income elderly might go unmet.

This problem is likely to get worse. The number of low-income elderly is expected to rise sharply in the next 10 years as baby boomers begin to turn 60. If participation rates for the elderly remain constant (as they have since the early 1980s), then the number of non-participating eligible elderly will only grow.

Recent research has identified five main reasons why elderly individuals do not participate in the FSP (Ponza and McConnell 1996; McConnell and Ponza 1999):

1. ***Perceived Lack of Need.*** Despite their low income, many nonparticipating elderly feel that they do not need food stamps, while others perceive their need as being only temporary. Yet evidence suggests that many of those who say they do not need food stamps are still not food secure. When probed about this inconsistency, some of these elderly nonparticipants indicate they feel that they *should* be able to manage without food stamps and were ashamed that they could not. Thus, some elderly who claim they do not need food stamps might not be participating for other reasons, such as to avoid the stigma associated with the program.
2. ***Lack of Information.*** Lack of information is a common reason that the elderly do not participate in the FSP. Some eligible elderly are unaware of the existence of the program, while many more know about the program, but have limited knowledge of program specifics, such as where or how to apply for benefits or whether they are eligible. Surveys have found that about one-third to one-half of nonparticipants identified as FSP-eligible think that they are ineligible. Many believe that their assets are too high or that they are categorically ineligible because they have no children or because they are elderly. Often, these misconceptions about the FSP are based on inaccurate information from family and friends.
3. ***Low Expected Benefits.*** Some poor elderly individuals think that it is not worthwhile to apply for food stamps given the small amount of benefits they would receive. Many elderly households are eligible for only the minimum food stamp allotment for one- and two-person households of \$10. In 1999, while the average monthly benefit to households with elderly was \$61, 28 percent of participating households with elderly persons received monthly benefits of \$10 or less, and 41 percent received \$25 or less. These benefit amounts are far lower than that of the average food stamp household; the average monthly benefit program-wide was \$162, with only 10 percent of all households receiving \$10 or less, and 15 percent receiving \$25 or less.

4. ***High Costs of Applying.*** The cost in terms of both time and money of applying for food stamps is often too high for elderly nonparticipants, especially those eligible for small benefit amounts. Bartlett et al. (1992) estimated that the average applicant (elderly or otherwise) takes nearly five hours to complete the food stamp application and spends more than \$10 on transportation and other expenses. In addition to time and money costs, the hassle of applying for food stamps can be significant. Due to transportation difficulties and physical limitations, elderly individuals often find it difficult to get to the local food stamp office. Additionally, elderly people might have trouble completing application forms because they have difficulty recalling information and/or cannot read the small print on the application.
5. ***Stigma.*** The stigma of applying for and using food stamps might be a barrier to participation. Feelings of embarrassment, a sense of failure, hurt pride, dislike of receiving government assistance, and the perceived loss of independence in using food stamps are reasons elderly people cite for not participating in the FSP. Moreover, some researchers have suggested that recent welfare reform changes that promote work over welfare might have increased the stigma of receiving welfare. Conflicting evidence exists on how important stigma is as a deterrent to FSP participation among the elderly. While more than half (67 percent) of 51 state FSP directors surveyed in a recent study by the GAO indicated that stigma is a major reason for nonparticipation (GAO 2000), surveys of elderly nonparticipants suggest that few elderly feel it is the main reason for not participating.

These five reasons are not mutually exclusive; many elderly cite multiple reasons for nonparticipation, and the reasons are often related. For example, some elderly people do not participate because they do not understand how the program works, but in their desire to avoid the embarrassment and stigma associated with being “on welfare,” they do not seek information on the program. Similarly, many households that don’t participate because they believe their benefits are low might participate if they thought it would take minimal effort to apply for benefits.

## **B. THREE DEMONSTRATION MODELS TO INCREASE THE ELDERLY’S FSP PARTICIPATION RATES**

USDA developed three demonstration models that are intended to increase elderly participation in the FSP: (1) the Simplified Eligibility and Benefit Determination model, (2) the Application Assistance for Eligible Elderly model, and (3) the Alternative Food Stamp

Commodity Benefit model. These models seek to reduce the barriers to FSP participation that the elderly face. Strategies include simplifying the application process, increasing eligible elderly individuals' understanding of the program, assisting elderly individuals with the application process, or providing food stamp benefits as commodities rather than either coupons or as payments on an EBT card. All three models rely heavily on publicity campaigns to expand outreach efforts to eligible elderly. These campaigns will increase awareness of FSP eligibility, nutritional issues, and demonstration benefits.

USDA has entered into cooperative agreements with five states to implement these demonstration models.<sup>2</sup> Florida is implementing the simplified eligibility and benefit determination model; Maine and Michigan are implementing the application assistance model; and Connecticut and North Carolina are implementing the alternative food stamp commodities model. To facilitate an evaluation of the separate effects of each demonstration, USDA requires that states not combine components of the various models.

## **1. Simplified Eligibility and Benefit Determination Model**

The simplified eligibility and benefit determination model (referred to as the “simplified eligibility” model) is designed to reduce the burden associated with applying for food stamps by simplifying the process of determining eligibility. Currently, households that contain at least one person age 60 years or older are eligible for food stamps if everyone in the household receives Supplemental Security Income (SSI) or if their combined income and assets meet the following two rules:

1. ***The household's gross monthly income less certain deductions (its net income) is below 100 percent of the federal poverty guidelines.*** Deductions include a standard

---

<sup>2</sup>A sixth state may receive demonstration funding before the evaluation begins.

deduction of \$134 (in most states) for each household, a deduction for monthly medical expenses above \$35, a deduction for shelter costs in excess of 50 percent of net income after applying the other deductions, as well as deductions for earnings, dependent care expenses, and child support payments.

2. ***The sum of the household's countable assets is below \$3,000.*** Countable assets include cash on hand, checking and savings account balances, stocks and bonds, and most retirement accounts. Furthermore, the value of some tangible assets is counted. In particular, a portion of the value of most vehicles is counted toward assets (generally the fair market value of the vehicle in excess of \$4,650 is counted; vehicles used to transport disabled individuals are not counted). Also, the equity value of certain recreational property is counted.

For all households that meet the eligibility criteria, benefits are computed as a function of the number of persons in the household, the household's net income, and the maximum benefit levels.<sup>3</sup> Households applying for food stamps must provide adequate documentation to verify the information used to deem eligibility and calculate benefits. For example, they must provide documentation to verify earnings, medical expenses, and asset holdings.

#### **a. Florida's Simplified Eligibility Pilot**

Florida's simplified eligibility demonstration is available to households consisting of elderly individuals only and will be implemented in two pilot counties, Gadsden and Leon. The demonstration will take several steps to reduce the burden of applying for food stamps. Elderly individuals applying for food stamps will be given a short, one-page application that asks only relevant information (the longer, universal form requests information about the age of children and other characteristics not relevant to this population). Elderly individuals will not have to

---

<sup>3</sup>The maximum benefit level is tied to the cost of purchasing a nutritionally adequate low-cost diet, as measured by USDA's Thrifty Food Plan. The benefit is calculated by subtracting 30 percent of the household's counted net income—the amount that the household is thought to be able to spend on food from its income—from the maximum benefit level for the household size. Currently, the maximum benefit level for a one-person household is \$130. Eligible one- and two-person households are guaranteed a minimum monthly food stamp benefit of \$10, while households of three or more have no minimum benefit.

provide documentation verifying their income and deduction amounts. In particular, they will not have to document earnings, SSI or Social Security income, medical expenses, or asset holdings. Completed applications can be mailed or faxed to the local office, or the individual, a friend, or an advocate can drop them off. The face-to-face application and recertification interviews will be waived.

The Florida demonstration will require applicants to verify citizenship status. Additionally, the state will verify Social Security numbers, Social Security income and SSI income using existing databases. Because the shorter application form is part of the application assistance model and not the simplified eligibility model, the state will also use the shorter form in two comparison counties: Alachua and Jackson counties but will not change the rules.

## **2. Application Assistance for Eligible Elderly Model**

The application assistance for eligible elderly model (referred to as the “application assistance” model) uses strategies designed to improve outreach to eligible nonparticipants and to reduce the burden of applying for food stamps. Under this demonstration, eligibility rules will remain unchanged, but elderly people will be provided with help in understanding program requirements and in completing their applications. Sites implementing application assistance models will link elderly applicants with application assistance workers from nonprofit community service organizations. Assistance workers will provide one-on-one application assistance, helping elderly applicants assemble documents needed to apply for food stamps, understand the application, and complete forms. Application assistance workers may also participate in the applicant’s caseworker interviews to interpret difficult questions and prevent errors. This assistance is intended not only to help the elderly meet program requirements but also to provide emotional support. Maine and Michigan are the two states that have developed variations of the application assistance model.

**a. Maine's Application Assistance Pilot**

Maine's application assistance program will be implemented in Waldo County. The county plans to hire three application assistants to help applicants understand the FSP application and eligibility rules, assemble the documentation necessary to apply, complete and submit the application, and secure transportation, if necessary. This one-on-one assistance will occur in homes, senior centers, or wherever the applicant feels comfortable. The three application assistants will be hired from participants in the Senior Community Services Employment Program (SCSEP). As a result, assistants will be similar to the FSP applicants in terms of age and income. Assistants will be trained to understand the FSP eligibility rules and requirements. As part of their duties, assistants will prescreen applicants, but will not be able to determine eligibility. The face-to-face application interview will be waived.

**b. Michigan's Application Assistance Pilot**

Michigan's application assistance pilot features an on-line application that can be accessed at all senior centers in the pilot site, Genesee County. Senior center staff will assist elderly applicants understand FSP eligibility rules and help them complete an FSP application. Senior center staff will work one-on-one with applicants to complete the application. To make the process easier for the applicant, staff will enter the applicant's data into the on-line application. For demonstration participants, the face-to-face interviews conducted by application assistance persons will be accepted in place of those conducted by Michigan Family Independence Agency workers. Center staff will be authorized to complete verification of application information. The on-line form will collect additional information to enable staff to conduct a nutritional risk assessment and to screen for eligibility for a variety of nutritional programs.

Michigan's pilot builds on an existing on-line application system called Michigan's Coordinated Access to Food for the Elderly (MiCAFE). The MiCAFE system targets individuals



applying for assistance through the Michigan Emergency Pharmacy Program for Seniors (MEPPS). The system is used in senior centers to conduct a nutritional assessment, screen for home-delivered meal eligibility and determine eligibility for congregate meals. The system also determines eligibility for MEPPS. For this demonstration, additional screens will be added to MiCAFE to help elderly enroll in the FSP.

### **3. Alternative Food Stamp Commodity Benefit Model**

Under the alternative food stamp commodity benefit model (referred to as the “commodity alternative”), elderly FSP households will have the option of receiving one or two packages of commodities each month instead of food stamp coupons or an Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) card. Food packages will be designed to meet the unique nutritional needs of the elderly. In areas with large multicultural populations, packages might include ethnic or traditional foods in an attempt to attract new elderly participants from these groups.

Households participating in this model will be limited to those in which all members are elderly, and households can receive one package for every eligible elderly member. Households applying for food stamps can choose between the food packages and traditional food stamp benefits. With some restrictions, households that select commodities can switch to food stamps, and vice versa.

The contents of the commodities packages will be targeted to the needs of the elderly. The demonstration sites will consult with a nutritionist in developing the packages and will also take into consideration the specific needs and preferences of low-income elderly in the demonstration community. Demonstration sites may develop a variety of packages, each for a different target population (for example, diabetics, specific ethnic groups).

Nonprofit food distribution programs that partner with the state FSP office will distribute commodities packages. These organizations will take primary responsibility for ordering,

storing and distributing the commodities packages. Other organizations, such as health service organizations, churches, and Meals on Wheels, will assist with publicity, nutrition education, and home deliveries. Commodities will be delivered to certain participants' homes. Most participants (or their authorized representatives) will pick up packages at local distribution centers.

The commodities model is designed to reduce the stigma associated with using food stamps or EBT cards in grocery stores because recipients will be less likely to be seen receiving welfare benefits. The model also is intended to make using FSP benefits easier and to increase client satisfaction. It is believed that clients receiving commodities packages will make fewer trips to the grocery store.

Each commodity package should cost the same as the average benefit that elderly FSP recipients receive in the commodity alternative pilot sites. This cost includes the cost of the commodities and the cost to the federal government of shipping the commodities to the commodity sites. Thus, if elderly households in a pilot site receive an average FSP benefit of \$40, then the demonstration can distribute packages whose contents cost \$40 to procure and ship. The cost of the packages will be the same for all participants, regardless of the benefit amount for which they are eligible.

**a. Connecticut's Commodity Alternative Pilot**

Connecticut's commodity pilot will work with the Community Renewal Team (CRT) to offer commodities packages to elderly households in the north central region, which includes Hartford. Residents of Hartford and nine surrounding towns will have the option of receiving two commodities packages a month instead of food stamps. Clients can pick up their packages at the local congregate meals site (called Senior Community Cafés), or, if they participate in the Meals on Wheels program, have the packages delivered to their homes.

The commodities packages will be tailored to meet clients' needs and preferences. CRT will identify client preferences through surveys of seniors at the Cafés. They will reassess preferences twice a year. Distributing packages twice a month will mean that each package is lighter in weight and more manageable for the elderly to carry. The packages might also include nutrition education information.

CRT will order and store food for the individual Cafés and Meals on Wheels programs. CRT's food bank, located in a Hartford warehouse facility, will receive the food and CRT staff will assemble packages at the warehouse. Packages will be included in normal distributions to Cafés and individual homes.

**b. North Carolina's Commodity Alternative Pilot**

The Loaves and Fishes Christian Food Ministry will operate North Carolina's commodity alternative pilot. FSP-eligible households in which all individuals are elderly will be offered commodity packages in lieu of traditional FSP benefits. Participants can pick up the packages at the central food bank facility or at one of several distribution sites. Participants with medical limitations, transportation difficulties, or other access problems can have food packages delivered to their homes.

The demonstration will take place in Alamance County, a county of 130,000 people in the central part of the state. A local nutritionist will design the food packages. Packages will be designed based in part on the findings of a survey of current FSP participants in the county. The packages will include pamphlets providing nutritional tips, food safety information and small portions recipes geared to the elderly.

## **C. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

The goal of this project is to design an evaluation that measures the effects of the elderly nutrition pilot programs and meets six research objectives:

1. Assess the effects of the demonstrations on elderly FSP participation
2. Assess the effects of the demonstrations on the average value of the FSP benefit that elderly households receive
3. Assess the effects of the demonstrations on client satisfaction with various aspects of the FSP
4. Quantify the federal, state, and local costs of the demonstrations
5. Assess the effects of the demonstrations on state and local FSP agencies, nonprofit organizations participating in the demonstrations, alternative food assistance providers, and other stakeholders
6. Describe the implementation of the demonstrations, problems encountered, solutions to these problems, and lessons learned.

The evaluation design includes both an impact analysis and a process analysis of each site's demonstration. The impact analysis will evaluate the effects of the demonstrations on FSP participation, average benefit levels, client satisfaction, and ongoing administrative costs of the demonstrations. The impact analysis will use a pre-post comparison group design. Administrative data and a survey of demonstration participants will provide key information to support the analyses. The process analysis will quantify the costs of the demonstration, identify the effects of the demonstrations on stakeholders, and describe the implementation process. The evaluation objectives, related subsidiary issues, and methodological implications, are described below and are summarized in Table I.1.

TABLE I.1  
OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION OBJECTIVES, DATA SOURCES,  
AND EVALUATION DESIGN ISSUES

Evaluation Objective	Data Sources	Methodology	Evaluation Design Issues
(1) Assess effect on FSP participation	FSP participation data obtained for sites from states	Descriptive analysis of data from pre/post comparison group analysis	Identifying appropriate comparison sites  Acquiring data  Determining whether change in participation occurred at demonstration site  Determining extent to which change in participation (if any) was due to demonstration or other factors
(2) Assess effect on level of food stamp benefits	Participation data obtained for sites from states	Descriptive analysis of data from pre/post comparison group analysis	Determining whether change in average benefits occurred at demonstration site  Measuring value of commodities
(3) Assess effect on client satisfaction	Survey of elderly clients who apply/recertify for food stamps  Discussions with stakeholders	Descriptive and multivariate regression analysis	Assessing the reliability and validity of satisfaction measures
(4) Quantify costs of the demonstrations	Quarterly reports  Structured discussions with stakeholders  Participation data	Descriptive comparisons  Process analysis	Compiling uniform and accurate cost measures across sites  Measuring cost of volunteers

TABLE I.1 (*continued*)

Evaluation Objective	Data Sources	Methodology	Evaluation Design Issues
(5) Assess effect on stakeholders	Discussions with stakeholders	Process analysis	Triangulating the findings by speaking with all relevant stakeholders
	Quarterly reports		Developing ways to encourage and secure participation of key informants
			Identifying the correct people to speak with in each organization
(6) Describe implementation process	Discussions with stakeholders	Process analysis	Identifying the correct people to speak with in each organization
	Quarterly reports		

## **1. Assess the Effects of the Demonstrations on Elderly FSP Participation**

Because a primary demonstration goal is to increase elderly FSP participation, a key objective of the evaluation is to measure the impact of each demonstration on the number of elderly households participating in the FSP. By comparing the rate of change in elderly participation in the pilot sites with the corresponding rate of change in elderly participation in similar comparison sites, the evaluation will attempt to identify how much of an observed change in elderly participation at the pilot sites is due to the demonstration versus other factors. The evaluation also will attempt to determine if those trends vary by subgroup (such as racial and ethnic groups, urban and rural residence, etc.). Administrative data will be used to measure the impacts on elderly participation.

## **2. Assess the Effects of the Demonstrations on the Average Value of FSP Benefits that Elderly Households Receive**

In affecting participation, the demonstration also might affect the average benefit paid to elderly residents in the pilot sites. All of the models might attract individuals eligible for higher-than-average or lower-than-average benefits. Additionally, the commodities alternative model might provide individuals with a package valued higher or lower than their traditional FSP benefits. Measuring the impact of the demonstrations will help USDA anticipate the costs associated with replicating the demonstrations on a larger scale. To measure this impact, the evaluation will compare the average benefit received by elderly households in the pilot site with the average benefit received by elderly in other sites. Additionally, for the commodity alternative demonstrations, the evaluation will determine how many households choose traditional benefits and how many choose commodity benefits. The evaluation will use administrative data to measure the impact on average benefits.

### **3. Assess the Effects of the Demonstrations on Client Satisfaction**

To assess whether the FSP better meets the needs of the low-income elderly population under the demonstrations, the evaluation will assess the level of client satisfaction with the FSP overall and with key components of the program, based on a survey of clients. Of particular interest for the simplified eligibility and application assistance models are the reasons why clients decided to select or not select this option, and among those who select it, whether the demonstration changes the clients' satisfaction with the application process—the time required, the out-of-pocket expenses incurred, and the general “hassle” involved with the process. Of particular interest for the commodity alternative model is the clients' satisfaction with receiving benefits in the form of commodities, in terms of the quality, quantity, and types of commodities received, and, also the process for receiving the commodities. The evaluation will measure whether the level of satisfaction varies with the characteristics of the elderly applicants. Findings from the client satisfaction survey can be used to interpret findings from the participation impact analysis.

### **4. Quantify the Federal, State, and Local Costs of the Demonstrations**

Understanding the costs of the demonstrations will help USDA anticipate the costs of replicating successful demonstrations on a larger scale. The evaluation will measure the costs associated with the start-up of the demonstration, including the cost of training staff, conducting publicity campaigns, and developing partnerships with outside organizations. It will also measure the cost of ongoing administration of the demonstrations, including not only the costs incurred the federal FSP, but also the costs incurred by the state and local FSP agencies, as well as by nonprofit organizations. Data to support the analyses will come from administrative reports, as well as discussions with program directors and stakeholders.



## **5. Assess the Effects of the Demonstrations on Stakeholders**

Although the demonstrations are designed to affect the FSP-eligible elderly population, the demonstrations also will affect other stakeholders, including the state and local FSP agencies, any partner organizations that help administer the demonstrations, and alternative food assistance providers in the community. The evaluation will assess the effect on each of these stakeholders. In particular, the evaluation will examine how the operations of the FSP local offices change because of the demonstration, including any changes in the application procedures, the roles of the caseworkers or the caseworker caseloads, concerns about fraud, and the services caseworkers provide. It will address whether services improved for elderly participants at the cost of poorer service to other participants. It also will assess whether the demonstrations had any effect on the demand for food from alternative food assistance providers. Data to support these analyses will come from semi-structured interviews and structured discussion sessions with key stakeholder staff, supplemented with data from the quarterly reports submitted by the sites.

## **6. Describe the Implementation of the Demonstrations**

Another important goal of the Elderly Nutrition Demonstrations is to identify how effective strategies can be replicated. To this end, the evaluation will describe in detail how each site implemented the demonstration. This will include a detailed description of the changes each agency—the state (and county, if applicable) FSP agency, local FSP agencies, and nonprofit organizations—made to implement the demonstration. All steps will be described, including the process for identifying and recruiting nonprofit organizations as partners, outreach efforts, changes to application forms, staff training, and any other administrative changes. The evaluation will also ask each stakeholder to describe the problems encountered in implementing the demonstration, how these problems were overcome, and what lessons were learned while implementing the demonstration. Understanding the problems involved in implementing the

demonstrations will not only assist future efforts to implement similar programs, but also it will assist the evaluators in interpreting the findings from the evaluation.

#### **D. STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT**

The remainder of this report describes the evaluation design for the Elderly Nutrition demonstrations. Chapter II explains the pre- and post- comparison group design and describes the steps needed to measure the impact on participation and benefits. Chapter III presents the survey and sampling plan design for measuring the impact on client satisfaction. Chapter IV describes how the costs of the demonstrations will be measured. Chapter V details the process analysis used to describe the implementation process and assess the effects of the demonstration on stakeholders.